

WEAKLY CLOSED LIE MODULES OF NEST ALGEBRAS

LINA OLIVEIRA AND MIGUEL SANTOS

ABSTRACT. Let $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ be a nest algebra of operators on Hilbert space and let $\mathcal{L}$ be a weakly closed Lie $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -module. We construct explicitly the largest possible weakly closed $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -bimodule $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L})$ and a weakly closed $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -bimodule $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})$ such that

$$\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}) \subseteq \mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L}) + \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})},$$

$[\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L}), \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})] \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})}$ is a von Neumann subalgebra of the diagonal $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N}) \cap \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})^*$.

1. INTRODUCTION

It has been established in [6] that any weakly closed Lie ideal $\mathcal{L}$ of a nest algebra $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ of operators on Hilbert space contains a weakly closed associative ideal of $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ and is contained in a sum of this ideal with a von Neumann subalgebra of the diagonal $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{N})$ of the nest algebra. That is to say that there exist a weakly closed associative ideal $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})$ and a von Neumann subalgebra $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})}$ of $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{N})$ such that

$$(1.1) \quad \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L}) \subseteq \mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L}) + \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})}.$$

The purpose of the present work is to show that a similar result holds when we pass from ideals to modules. More precisely, the main result Theorem 3.9 asserts that, if $\mathcal{L}$ is a weakly closed Lie $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -module, then

$$(1.2) \quad \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}) \subseteq \mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L}) + \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})},$$

where $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})}$ is a von Neumann subalgebra of the diagonal $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{N})$,

$$\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}) = \overline{\text{span}}^w(\{QB(\mathcal{H})P^\perp : P, Q \in \mathcal{N}, QB(\mathcal{H})P^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{L}\})$$

is the largest weakly closed $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -bimodule contained in $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})$ is a weakly closed $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -bimodule such that $[\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L}), \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})] \subseteq \mathcal{L}$, a result reminiscent of [5], Theorem 2.

Neither is it necessarily the case that $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L})$ be a subset of $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})$ nor that $\mathcal{L}$ be contained in $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})$, as Example 3.10 shows. However, when $\mathcal{L}$ is in fact a weakly closed Lie ideal, a refinement of both (1.1) and (1.2) can be obtained, as is outlined in Remark 3.11. In this situation, (1.1) and (1.2) coalesce yielding

$$(1.3) \quad \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L}) \subseteq \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}) \subseteq \mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L}) + \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})},$$

Date: December 10, 2015.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 47L35, 46K50, 17B60.

Key words and phrases. Bimodule, Lie ideal, Lie module, nest algebra.

The first author was partially funded by FCT/Portugal through UID/MAT/04459/2013 and EXCL/MAT-GEO/0222/2012. The second author was partially supported by a fellowship of the program “Novos Talentos em Matemática” of the Gulbenkian Foundation.

and $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})$ might even be a proper subset of $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L})$.

This work is organised in three sections. Section 2 addresses the question of describing the weakly closed $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -bimodules, and this is done in an essentially different way from those of [3, 4]. The main result of Section 2 is Lemma 2.8 which gives several characterisations of weakly closed $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -bimodules. This lemma is then used to prove Corollary 2.10, which provides a constructive description of the largest weakly closed $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -bimodule contained in any given weakly closed subspace of $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$. Section 3 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 3.9.

The notation is set in this final part of Section 1 and some facts needed in the sequel are also recalled.

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a complex Hilbert space, let $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be the complex Banach space of bounded linear operators on $\mathcal{H}$ and let $\mathcal{F}_1(\mathcal{H})$ be the set of rank one operators in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. A totally ordered family $\mathcal{N}$ of projections in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ containing 0 and the identity I is said to be a *nest*. If, furthermore, $\mathcal{N}$ is a complete sublattice of the lattice of projections in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, then $\mathcal{N}$ is called a *complete nest*. The *nest algebra* $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ associated with a nest $\mathcal{N}$ is the subalgebra of all operators T in $B(\mathcal{H})$ such that, for all projections P in $\mathcal{N}$, $T(P(\mathcal{H})) \subseteq P(\mathcal{H})$, or, equivalently, an operator T in $B(\mathcal{H})$ lies in $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ if and only if, for all projections P in the nest $\mathcal{N}$, $P^\perp TP = 0$, where $P^\perp = I - P$. Each nest is contained in a complete nest which generates the same nest algebra (cf. [2, 8]). Henceforth only complete nests will be considered.

The algebra $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ is a weakly closed subalgebra of $B(\mathcal{H})$, the *diagonal* $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{N})$ of which is the von Neumann algebra defined by $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{N}) = \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N}) \cap \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})^*$.

A nest algebra $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ together with the product defined, for all operators T and S in $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$, by $[T, S] = TS - ST$ is a Lie algebra. A complex subspace $\mathcal{M}$ of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is said to be a $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -*bimodule* if $\mathcal{M}\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N}), \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ and is called a *Lie $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -module* if $[\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})] \subseteq \mathcal{M}$. Lie $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -modules and $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -bimodules contained in the nest algebra $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ are called, respectively, Lie ideals and ideals of $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$. In the sequel, Lie $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -modules may be referred to as Lie modules for simplicity. For the same reason, $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -bimodules may be called simply bimodules.

Let x and y be elements of the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ and let $x \otimes y$ be the rank one operator defined, for all z in $\mathcal{H}$, by $z \mapsto \langle z, x \rangle y$, where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the inner product of $\mathcal{H}$. Let P be a projection in the nest $\mathcal{N}$ and let P_- be the projection in $\mathcal{N}$ defined by $P_- = \vee \{Q \in \mathcal{N} : Q < P\}$. A rank one operator $x \otimes y$ lies in $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ if, and only if, there exists a projection P such that $P_-x = 0$ and $Py = y$; moreover, P can be chosen to be equal to $\bigwedge \{Q \in \mathcal{N} : Qy = y\}$ (cf. [8]). For the general theory of nest algebras, the reader is referred to [2, 8].

In what follows, the closure in the norm topology of the span of a subset $\mathcal{X}$ of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ will be denoted by $\overline{\text{span}}(\mathcal{X})$, whereas its closure in the weak operator topology will be denoted by $\overline{\text{span}}^w(\mathcal{X})$. All subspaces either of $\mathcal{H}$ or of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ are assumed to be complex subspaces.

2. BIMODULES

Let z be an element of the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ and let P_z and $\hat{P}_z$ be the projections defined by

$$P_z = \bigwedge \{Q \in \mathcal{N} : Qz = z\} \quad , \quad \hat{P}_z = \bigvee \{Q \in \mathcal{N} : Qz = 0\}.$$

The projections P_z and $\hat{P}_z$ lie in the nest $\mathcal{N}$ and $P_z z = z$, $\hat{P}_z z = 0$. Following [7], each rank one operator $x \otimes y$ will be associated with the projections $\hat{P}_x$ and P_y .

Remark 2.1. Observe that, for all $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$ and all $T \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$, $P_{Ty} \leq P_y$ and $\hat{P}_x \leq \hat{P}_{T^*x}$. In fact, $Ty = P_y T P_y y = P_y T y$ which shows that $P_{Ty} \leq P_y$. Similarly, $T^*x = \hat{P}_x^\perp T^* \hat{P}_x^\perp x = \hat{P}_x^\perp T^* x$, yielding that $\hat{P}_x \leq \hat{P}_{T^*x}$.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\mathcal{V}$ be a weakly closed $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -bimodule and let $x \otimes y$ be a rank one operator in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Then $x \otimes y$ lies in $\mathcal{V}$ if and only if $P_y \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \hat{P}_x^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{V}$.*

Proof. Let $x \otimes y$ be a rank one operator lying in $\mathcal{V}$. Then, by [4], Theorem 1.5, there exists a left order continuous homomorphism $P \mapsto \tilde{P}$ on $\mathcal{N}$ such that an operator $T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ lies in $\mathcal{V}$ if and only if, for all $P \in \mathcal{N}$, $\tilde{P}^\perp T P = 0$. Let T lie in $P_y \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \hat{P}_x^\perp$ and suppose that $P \in \mathcal{N}$ is a projection such that $P \leq \hat{P}_x$. Then,

$$(2.1) \quad \tilde{P}^\perp T P = \tilde{P}^\perp P_y T \hat{P}_x^\perp P = 0,$$

which shows that $T \in \mathcal{V}$. Suppose now that $\hat{P}_x < P$. Since $x \otimes y \in \mathcal{V}$, by the definition of $\tilde{P}$, $P_y \leq \tilde{P}$ (see [4], p. 221). Hence

$$(2.2) \quad \tilde{P}^\perp T P = \tilde{P}^\perp P_y T \hat{P}_x^\perp P = 0.$$

Combining (2.1)-(2.2) yields that $P_y \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \hat{P}_x^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{V}$.

The converse assertion is clear. □

The underlying role of the rank one operators in the construction of a bimodule, outlined by Lemma 2.2, suggests that the following definitions be made. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a subspace of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and let $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})$ be the subset of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ defined by

$$(2.3) \quad \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M}) = \{x \otimes y \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) : P_y \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \hat{P}_x^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{M}\},$$

and let

$$(2.4) \quad \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{M}) = \overline{\text{span}}^w(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M}))$$

Since $x \otimes y = P_y(x \otimes y) \hat{P}_x^\perp$, for any given rank one operator $x \otimes y$, it immediately follows that $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M}) \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ and, consequently, it is also the case that $\text{span}(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})) \subseteq \mathcal{M}$.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a subspace of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Then $\text{span}(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M}))$ is a $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -bimodule contained in $\mathcal{M}$, and $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{M})$ is a weakly closed $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -bimodule such that*

$$\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{M}) = \overline{\text{span}}^w(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})) = \overline{\text{span}}^w\left(\bigcup_{x \otimes y \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})} P_y \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \hat{P}_x^\perp\right).$$

Proof. To prove that $\text{span}(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M}))$ is a $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -bimodule contained in $\mathcal{M}$, it suffices to show that, for all $T \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$, $T\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M}), \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})T \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})$. Suppose that $x \otimes y$ is an operator in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})$ and consider the rank one operator $T(x \otimes y) = x \otimes Ty$. Then, since $P_{Ty} \leq P_y$ (see Remark 2.1) and $P_{Ty} \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, it follows that

$$P_{Ty} \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \hat{P}_x^\perp = P_y P_{Ty} \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \hat{P}_x^\perp \subseteq P_y \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \hat{P}_x^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{M}.$$

Hence, $T(x \otimes y)$ lies in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})$. Similarly, considering the product $(x \otimes y)T = T^*x \otimes y$,

$$P_y\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})\hat{P}_{T^*x}^\perp = P_y\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})\hat{P}_{T^*x}^\perp\hat{P}_x^\perp \subseteq P_y\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})\hat{P}_x^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{M},$$

which shows that $(x \otimes y)T$ lies in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})$. Consequently, both $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ are subsets of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})$ and, therefore, $\text{span}(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M}))$ is a bimodule. Since the multiplication in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is separately continuous in the weak operator topology, it follows that the closure of a bimodule in this topology is also a bimodule. Hence, $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{M})$ is a weakly closed bimodule.

It is clear that any operator $x \otimes y$ in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})$ must also lie $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{M})$. Hence, by Lemma 2.2, $P_y\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})\hat{P}_x^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{M})$. Consequently, $\bigcup_{x \otimes y \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})} P_y\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})\hat{P}_x^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{M})$ and, therefore,

$$(2.5) \quad \overline{\text{span}}^w\left(\bigcup_{x \otimes y \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})} P_y\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})\hat{P}_x^\perp\right) \subseteq \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{M}).$$

On the other hand, since $x \otimes y \in P_y\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})\hat{P}_x^\perp$ for any given operator $x \otimes y$, it follows that

$$\text{span}(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})) \subseteq \text{span}\left(\bigcup_{x \otimes y \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})} P_y\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})\hat{P}_x^\perp\right).$$

Hence

$$(2.6) \quad \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{M}) = \overline{\text{span}}^w(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})) \subseteq \overline{\text{span}}^w\left(\bigcup_{x \otimes y \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})} P_y\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})\hat{P}_x^\perp\right).$$

Combining (2.5)-(2.6) yields that

$$\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{M}) = \overline{\text{span}}^w\left(\bigcup_{x \otimes y \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})} P_y\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})\hat{P}_x^\perp\right),$$

as required. $\square$

Remark 2.4. It is obvious from Lemma 2.3 that $\overline{\text{span}}(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M}))$ is the smallest norm closed bimodule containing $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})$. It is also clear that $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{M})$ is the smallest weakly closed bimodule containing $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})$.

Proposition 2.5. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a subspace of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and let $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{M})$ be as in (2.4). Then $\mathcal{M}$ is a weakly closed $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -bimodule if and only if $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{M})$.*

Proof. It immediately follows from Lemma 2.3 that, if $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{M})$, then $\mathcal{M}$ is a weakly closed bimodule. Conversely, suppose that $\mathcal{M}$ is a weakly closed bimodule. Then, by Remark 2.4, $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{M})$ is the smallest weakly closed bimodule containing $\mathcal{M}$ and, therefore, coincides with $\mathcal{M}$ itself. $\square$

Corollary 2.6. *Let $\mathcal{M}_1$ and $\mathcal{M}_2$ be weakly closed $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -bimodules such that $\mathcal{M}_1 \cap \mathcal{F}_1(\mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{M}_2 \cap \mathcal{F}_1(\mathcal{H})$. Then $\mathcal{M}_1$ and $\mathcal{M}_2$ coincide.*

Proof. It is an immediate consequence of Lemma 2.2 and Proposition 2.5 that weakly closed bimodules having the same subset of rank one operators must coincide. $\square$

Although the map ϕ in the next lemma be generally presented, its definition is in fact rooted in the investigation of the structure of weakly closed Lie $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -modules initiated in [1].

Lemma 2.7. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a weakly closed subspace of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Then the map $P \mapsto \phi(P)$ defined on $\mathcal{N}$ by*

$$(2.7) \quad \phi(P) = \vee\{Q \in \mathcal{N} : Q\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})R^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{M}, R \in \mathcal{N}, R < P\}$$

is a left order continuous homomorphism on $\mathcal{N}$. Moreover, for all $P \in \mathcal{N}$,

$$(2.8) \quad \phi(P)\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})P^\perp \subseteq \phi(P)\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})P_-^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{M}.$$

Proof. If $P_1 \leq P_2$, then $\{Q \in \mathcal{N} : Q\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})R^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{M}, R \in \mathcal{N}, R < P_1\}$ is a subset of $\{Q \in \mathcal{N} : Q\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})R^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{M}, R \in \mathcal{N}, R < P_2\}$, from which immediately follows that $\phi(P_1) \leq \phi(P_2)$. Hence ϕ is an order homomorphism on $\mathcal{N}$. Notice that, for all projections $Q \in \mathcal{N}$,

$$(2.9) \quad Q\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})P_2^\perp \subseteq Q\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})P_1^\perp.$$

It follows from (2.9) that, for all $Q, P \in \mathcal{N}$,

$$(2.10) \quad Q\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})P^\perp \subseteq Q\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})(P_-)^\perp.$$

Let (Q_l) be a net in $\{Q \in \mathcal{N} : Q\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})R^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{M}, R \in \mathcal{N}, R < P\}$ strongly converging to $\phi(P)$. For all l , there exists a projection R_l such that $R_l < P$ and

$$Q_l\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})P^\perp \subseteq Q_l\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})R_l^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{M}.$$

Consequently, if $P = P_-$, then

$$Q_l\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})P^\perp = Q_l\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})P_-^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{M}.$$

Since $\mathcal{M}$ is weakly closed and, hence, strongly closed, by the separate strong continuity of the multiplication, it now follows that $\phi(P)\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})P^\perp = \phi(P)\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})P_-^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{M}$.

If, on the other hand, $P_- < P$, then, combining (2.7) and (2.9),

$$\phi(P) = \vee\{Q \in \mathcal{N} : Q\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})P_-^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{M}\}.$$

Consequently, there exists a net (Q_j) strongly converging to $\phi(P)$ and such that, for all j , $Q_j\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})P_-^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{M}$. Observe that it is also the case that (Q_j) weakly converges to $\phi(P)$. It now follows from the separate continuity of the multiplication in the weak operator topology that $\phi(P)\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})P_-^\perp \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{M}}^w = \mathcal{M}$. Hence, using (2.10),

$$\phi(P)\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})P^\perp \subseteq \phi(P)\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})P_-^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{M},$$

which concludes the proof of (2.8).

It only remains to show that the map ϕ is left order continuous; that is to say that, for every subset $\mathcal{X}$ of $\mathcal{N}$, $\phi(\vee\mathcal{X}) = \vee\phi(\mathcal{X})$. This trivially holds for the empty set. Suppose then in what follows that $\mathcal{X} \neq \emptyset$. If $\vee\mathcal{X} \in \mathcal{X}$, then the equality $\phi(\vee\mathcal{X}) = \vee\phi(\mathcal{X})$ is obvious, since ϕ is an order-preserving map. If, on the other hand, $\vee\mathcal{X} \notin \mathcal{X}$ then $(\vee\mathcal{X})_- = \vee\mathcal{X}$.

Hence, suppose now that $P \in \mathcal{N}$ is such that $P_- = P$. In this case, $P = \vee\{R \in \mathcal{N} : R < P\}$ and, since ϕ is an order homomorphism, it is clear that $\vee\{\phi(R) \in \mathcal{N} : R < P\} \leq \phi(P)$.

If $\vee\{\phi(R) \in \mathcal{N} : R < P\} < \phi(P)$, then by (2.7) there would exist projections $R', Q \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $R' < P$, $\vee\{\phi(R) \in \mathcal{N} : R < P\} < Q$ and $Q\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})R'^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{M}$. But, in this case, $Q \leq \vee\{\phi(R) \in \mathcal{N} : R < P\}$ yielding a contradiction. It follows that $\phi(P) = \vee\{\phi(R) \in \mathcal{N} : R < P\}$, as required. Letting $P = \vee\mathcal{X}$, one finally has $\phi(\vee\mathcal{X}) = \vee\phi(\mathcal{X})$, which concludes the proof. $\square$

Lemma 2.8. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a subspace of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and let $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{M})$ be as in (2.4). The following assertions are equivalent.*

- (i) $\mathcal{M}$ is a weakly closed $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -bimodule.
- (ii) $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{M})$.
- (iii) There exists a left order continuous homomorphism $\phi: \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$, defined by

$$\phi(P) = \vee \{Q \in \mathcal{N} : Q\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})R^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{M}, R \in \mathcal{N}, R < P\},$$

and such that

$$(2.11) \quad \mathcal{M} = \{T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) : \phi(P)^\perp TP = 0\}.$$

(iv)

$$\mathcal{M} = \overline{\text{span}}^w(\{Q\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})P^\perp : P, Q \in \mathcal{N}, Q\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})P^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{M}\}).$$

Remark 2.9. It is clear that a set defined by any (not necessarily order-preserving) map ϕ as in (2.11) is a weakly closed $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -bimodule. It has already been shown in [4] that, for each weakly closed $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -bimodule $\mathcal{M}$, there exists a (not necessarily unique) left order continuous map $P \mapsto \tilde{P}$ on $\mathcal{N}$ describing $\mathcal{M}$ in the sense of (2.11). However, the map $P \mapsto \tilde{P}$ and the map ϕ above are differently defined and, whilst the proof of the existence of the map $P \mapsto \tilde{P}$ relies on the decomposability of the finite rank operators, the proof below is free of that assumption.

Proof. The equivalence (i) $\Leftrightarrow$ (ii) has already been proved in Proposition 2.5.

As observed in Remark 2.9, the set defined by (2.11) is necessarily a weakly closed $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -bimodule. Hence (iii) $\Rightarrow$ (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii).

To show that (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii), assume now that $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{M})$. It will be shown firstly that $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})$ coincides with the subset of rank one operators contained in $\{T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) : \phi(P)^\perp TP = 0\}$. Let $x \otimes y$ be a rank one operator in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})$, let P be a projection in $\mathcal{N}$ and suppose initially that $\hat{P}_x \leq P$. It follows, by Lemma 2.2 and the definition of ϕ , that $P_y \leq \phi(P)$ and, consequently,

$$\phi(P)^\perp(x \otimes y)P = \phi(P)^\perp P_y(x \otimes y)\hat{P}_x^\perp P = 0.$$

It can be similarly shown that $\phi(P)^\perp(x \otimes y)P = 0$, when $P < \hat{P}_x$. Hence $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M}) \subseteq \{T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) : \phi(P)^\perp TP = 0\}$.

Conversely, let $x \otimes y$ be an operator lying in the weakly closed bimodule

$$\{T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) : \phi(P)^\perp TP = 0\}.$$

It will be shown that $x \otimes y$ lies in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})$. By Lemma 2.2, this is equivalent to proving that, for all $T \in P_y\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})\hat{P}_x^\perp$ and all $P \in \mathcal{N}$, $\phi(P)^\perp TP = 0$. Suppose then that T is an operator in $P_y\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})\hat{P}_x^\perp$. If $P \leq \hat{P}_x$, then

$$\phi(P)^\perp TP = \phi(P)^\perp P_y T \hat{P}_x^\perp P = 0.$$

On the other hand, if $\hat{P}_x < P$ then, since $x \otimes y$ lies in $\{T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) : \phi(P)^\perp TP = 0\}$, it immediately follows from the definition of ϕ that $P_y \leq \phi(P)$. Hence

$$\phi(P)^\perp TP = \phi(P)^\perp P_y T \hat{P}_x^\perp P = 0.$$

It has been shown that a rank one operator lies in the weakly closed bimodule $\{T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) : \phi(P)^\perp TP = 0\}$ if and only if it lies in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})$ or, in other words, if the rank one operators in both sets are exactly the same. By Corollary 2.6, weakly closed bimodules having the same subset of rank one operators must coincide. Hence $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{M}) = \{T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) : \phi(P)^\perp TP = 0\}$, as required. The left order continuity of ϕ is a consequence of Lemma 2.7.

Assume that $\mathcal{M}$ is the weakly closed subspace of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ defined in (iv). Observe that, for every $P, Q \in \mathcal{N}$, the subspace $Q\mathcal{B}(H)P^\perp$ is a $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -bimodule. Hence $\text{span}(\{Q\mathcal{B}(H)P^\perp : P, Q \in \mathcal{N}, Q\mathcal{B}(H)P^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{M}\})$ is also a $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -bimodule, and from this immediately follows that the closure of this set in the weak operator topology is a weakly closed $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -bimodule. Hence (iv) $\Rightarrow$ (i).

On the other hand, by Proposition 2.5, if (i) holds, then $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{M})$. By Lemma 2.3, it follows that $\mathcal{M} = \overline{\text{span}}^w(\bigcup_{x \otimes y \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})} P_y \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \hat{P}_x^\perp)$. Hence, by Lemma 2.2, $\mathcal{M}$ is contained in the weakly closed $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -bimodule

$$\overline{\text{span}}^w(\{Q\mathcal{B}(H)P^\perp : P, Q \in \mathcal{N}, Q\mathcal{B}(H)P^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{M}\}).$$

If $\mathcal{M}$ were properly contained in this set, then, by Corollary 2.6, there would exist a rank one operator $x \otimes y = P_y(x \otimes y) \hat{P}_x$ lying in $\overline{\text{span}}^w(\{Q\mathcal{B}(H)P^\perp : P, Q \in \mathcal{N}, Q\mathcal{B}(H)P^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{M}\})$ but not in $\mathcal{M}$. Consequently, since this latter subspace is a weakly closed bimodule, by Lemma 2.2, $P_y \mathcal{B}(H) \hat{P}_x \subseteq \overline{\text{span}}^w(\{Q\mathcal{B}(H)P^\perp : P, Q \in \mathcal{N}, Q\mathcal{B}(H)P^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{M}\}) \subseteq \mathcal{M}$. Hence $x \otimes y$ would lie in $\mathcal{M}$, which contradicts the assumption. $\square$

Corollary 2.10. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a weakly closed subspace of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and let $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{M})$ be as in (2.4). Then $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{M})$ is the largest weakly closed $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -bimodule contained in $\mathcal{M}$.*

Proof. It is clear that, if $\mathcal{M}$ is weakly closed, then $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{M}) = \overline{\text{span}}^w(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{M})) \subseteq \mathcal{M}$.

Suppose that there exists a weakly closed bimodule $\mathcal{V}$ contained in $\mathcal{M}$ which properly contains $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{M})$. Then, by Lemma 2.8, $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{V})$ and, thus, $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{V}) = \overline{\text{span}}^w(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{V})) \supsetneq \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{M})$. Hence, by Corollary 2.6, there exists a rank one operator $x \otimes y \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{M})$ such that

$$(2.12) \quad P_y \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \hat{P}_x^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{M}.$$

But this is impossible since, by the definition of $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{M})$, this bimodule contains all operators $x \otimes y$ satisfying (2.12). Hence $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{M})$ is the largest weak operator closed bimodule contained in $\mathcal{M}$. $\square$

3. LIE MODULES

The following theorem summarises the results of the previous section when $\mathcal{M}$ is a Lie $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -module.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a weakly closed Lie $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -module of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and let*

$$\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{L}) = \{x \otimes y \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) : P_y \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \hat{P}_x^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{L}\}.$$

Then, the largest weakly closed $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -bimodule contained in $\mathcal{L}$ is $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}) = \overline{\text{span}}^w(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{L}))$. Moreover,

$$\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}) = \overline{\text{span}}^w\left(\bigcup_{x \otimes y \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{L})} P_y \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \hat{P}_x^\perp\right) = \overline{\text{span}}^w(\{Q\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})P^\perp : P, Q \in \mathcal{N}, Q\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})P^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{L}\}).$$

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a Lie $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -module and let $P, Q \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ be mutually orthogonal projections. Then, for all $T \in \mathcal{L}$, the operators PTQ, QTP lie in $\mathcal{L}$.*

Proof. Since $PQ = 0$, it is easily seen that $QTP = \frac{1}{2}([[[T, P], Q], Q] - [[T, P], Q])$, from which follows that $QTP \in \mathcal{L}$. The remaining assertion can be similarly proved. $\square$

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a weakly closed Lie $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -module and let P be a projection in $\mathcal{N}$. If $P^\perp \mathcal{L} P \neq \{0\}$, then $P \mathcal{L} P^\perp = P \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) P^\perp$.*

Proof. Let $P \in \mathcal{N}$ and $T \in \mathcal{L}$ be such that $P^\perp T P \neq 0$. Notice that Lemma 3.2 guarantees that $P^\perp T P \in \mathcal{L}$. To prove the assertion, it suffices to show that, for all $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$, the operator $P(x \otimes y)P^\perp$ lies in $\mathcal{L}$. This trivially holds when $P(x \otimes y)P^\perp = 0$. Assume now that $P(x \otimes y)P^\perp$ is a rank one operator. Then

$$(3.1) \quad [[P(x \otimes y)P^\perp, P^\perp T P], P(x \otimes y)P^\perp] = 2P(x \otimes y)P^\perp T P(x \otimes y)P^\perp$$

and, therefore,

$$(3.2) \quad [[P(x \otimes y)P^\perp, P^\perp T P], P(x \otimes y)P^\perp] = 2\langle P^\perp T P y, x \rangle P(x \otimes y)P^\perp$$

lies in $\mathcal{L}$. It follows that $P(x \otimes y)P^\perp \in \mathcal{L}$, whenever $\langle P^\perp T P y, x \rangle \neq 0$.

On the other hand, if $x \perp P^\perp T P y$, then suppose firstly that $P^\perp T P y \neq 0$. In this case, replacing $x \otimes y$ by $P^\perp T P y \otimes P y$ in the above computations yields that the operator $P^\perp T P y \otimes P y$ lies in $\mathcal{L}$. Notice that the condition under which it can be deduced from (3.2) that $P^\perp T P y \otimes P y \in \mathcal{L}$ is, in this case, that $\langle P^\perp T P y, P^\perp T P y \rangle \neq 0$, which clearly holds. Moreover, since $\langle P^\perp T P y - x, P^\perp T P y \rangle \neq 0$, it also follows from (3.2) that $(P^\perp T P y - P^\perp x) \otimes P y$ lies in $\mathcal{L}$. Hence,

$$P(x \otimes y)P^\perp = P^\perp T P y \otimes P y - (P^\perp T P y - P^\perp x) \otimes P y$$

lies in $\mathcal{L}$.

Assume now that $P^\perp T P y = 0$. Since $P^\perp T P \neq 0$, there exists $z \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $P^\perp T P z \neq 0$, from which follows that $P^\perp T P(z - y) \neq 0$. Applying a reasoning similar to that of the preceding paragraph, it follows that both $P(x \otimes z)P^\perp$ and $P(x \otimes (z - y))P^\perp$ lie in $\mathcal{L}$. Hence, $P(x \otimes y)P^\perp = P(x \otimes z)P^\perp - P(x \otimes (z - y))P^\perp$ lies in $\mathcal{L}$, which concludes the proof. $\square$

Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a Lie $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -module and let $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})$ be the subspace of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ defined by

$$(3.3) \quad \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L}) = \mathcal{K}_V(\mathcal{L}) + \mathcal{K}_L(\mathcal{L}) + \mathcal{K}_D(\mathcal{L}) + \mathcal{K}_\Delta(\mathcal{L}),$$

where

$$(3.4) \quad \mathcal{K}_V(\mathcal{L}) = \overline{\text{span}}^w \{PTP^\perp : P \in \mathcal{N}, T \in \mathcal{L}\},$$

$$(3.5) \quad \mathcal{K}_L(\mathcal{L}) = \overline{\text{span}}^w \{P^\perp T P : P \in \mathcal{N}, T \in \mathcal{L}\},$$

$$(3.6) \quad \mathcal{K}_D(\mathcal{L}) = \overline{\text{span}}^w \{PSP^\perp T P : P \in \mathcal{N}, T \in \mathcal{L}, S \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})\},$$

$$(3.7) \quad \mathcal{K}_\Delta(\mathcal{L}) = \overline{\text{span}}^w \{P^\perp T P S P^\perp : P \in \mathcal{N}, T \in \mathcal{L}, S \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})\}.$$

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a weakly closed Lie $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -module and let $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mathcal{K}_V(\mathcal{L})$ be as in (3.3) and (3.4), respectively. Then, $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})$ is a weakly closed $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -bimodule and $\mathcal{K}_V(\mathcal{L})$ is a weakly closed ideal of $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ such that $\mathcal{K}_V(\mathcal{L}) \subseteq \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L})$.*

Remark 3.5. Notice that $\mathcal{K}_V(\mathcal{L})$ is a subspace of $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ and that, by Lemma 3.2, the spaces $\mathcal{K}_V(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mathcal{K}_L(\mathcal{L})$ are contained in $\mathcal{L}$.

Proof. It is clear that $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mathcal{K}_V(\mathcal{L})$ are weakly closed subspaces of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and, as observed in Remark 3.5, $\mathcal{K}_V(\mathcal{L}) \subseteq \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$.

To see that $\mathcal{K}_V(\mathcal{L})$ is an ideal of $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$, it suffices to show that, for all $T \in \mathcal{L}, P \in \mathcal{N}, S \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ one has that both $PTP^\perp S$ and $SPTP^\perp$ lie in $\mathcal{K}_V(\mathcal{L})$. Since $P^\perp SP^\perp \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ and since, by Lemma 3.2, $PTP^\perp$ lies in $\mathcal{L}$, it follows that

$$PTP^\perp S = PTP^\perp P^\perp SP^\perp = [PTP^\perp, P^\perp SP^\perp]$$

lies in $\mathcal{L}$. But $PTP^\perp S = P(PTP^\perp S)P^\perp$, which shows that $PTP^\perp S$ lies in $\mathcal{K}_V(\mathcal{L})$.

Similarly,

$$SPTP^\perp = PSPPTP^\perp = [PSP, PTP^\perp]$$

lies in $\mathcal{L}$ and, therefore, $SPTP^\perp = P(SPTP^\perp)P^\perp$ lies in $\mathcal{K}_V(\mathcal{L})$. Since it has been shown that $\mathcal{K}_V(\mathcal{L})$ is a weakly closed ideal of $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$, it immediately follows from Theorem 3.1 that $\mathcal{K}_V(\mathcal{L}) \subseteq \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L})$.

It will be shown next that $\mathcal{K}_L(\mathcal{L})\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N}), \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})\mathcal{K}_L(\mathcal{L}) \subseteq \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})$. It suffices to show that, for all $T \in \mathcal{L}, P \in \mathcal{N}$ and $S \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$, the operators $P^\perp TPS, SP^\perp TP$ lie in $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})$. Observe also that, if T is an operator in the Lie module $\mathcal{L}$, then, by Lemma 3.2, the operator $P^\perp TP$ lies in $\mathcal{L}$. Hence, it suffices to assume that $T \in \mathcal{L}$ is such that $T = P^\perp TP$, for some $P \in \mathcal{N}$, and then prove that $TS, ST \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})$, for all $S \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$.

Let T be an operator in $\mathcal{L}$ such that $T = P^\perp TP$, and let S be an operator in the nest algebra. It follows that

$$TS = P^\perp TPSP + P^\perp TPSP^\perp.$$

It is clear that $P^\perp TPSP^\perp \in \mathcal{K}_\Delta(\mathcal{L})$. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} P^\perp TPSP &= [P^\perp TP, PSP] \\ &= P^\perp [T, PSP]P. \end{aligned}$$

Since $[T, PSP] \in \mathcal{L}$, it follows that $P^\perp TPSP \in \mathcal{K}_L(\mathcal{L})$. Hence, TS lies in $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})$, as required.

Similarly,

$$ST = P^\perp ST + PST = [P^\perp SP^\perp, T] + PSP^\perp TP$$

lies in $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})$, since $PSP^\perp TP \in \mathcal{K}_D(\mathcal{L})$ and $[P^\perp SP^\perp, T] = P^\perp [P^\perp SP^\perp, T]P$ lies in $\mathcal{K}_L(\mathcal{L})$.

To show that $\mathcal{K}_D(\mathcal{L})\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N}), \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})\mathcal{K}_D(\mathcal{L}) \subseteq \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})$, it suffices to prove that for all $T \in \mathcal{L}, S, R \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ and $P \in \mathcal{N}$, the operators $PSP^\perp TPR$ and $RPSP^\perp TP$ lie in $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})$.

As to the operator $RPSP^\perp TP$, observe that $RPSP^\perp TP = P(RPS)P^\perp TP$ and, since $RPS \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$, it immediately follows that $RPSP^\perp TP \in \mathcal{K}_D(\mathcal{L})$. Hence, $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})\mathcal{K}_D(\mathcal{L}) \subseteq \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})$.

It only remains to show that $PSP^\perp TPR \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})$. Observe that, by Lemma 3.3, either $P\mathcal{L}P^\perp = P\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})P^\perp$ or $P^\perp \mathcal{L}P = \{0\}$. In the latter case, it is obvious that the assertion to be proved trivially holds. In the former case, notice that, by Lemma 3.2, $P\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})P^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{L}$.

Let T, S, R be as above and let $P \in \mathcal{N}$ be such that $P\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})P^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{L}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} PSP^\perp TPR &= PSP^\perp TPRP + PSP^\perp TPRP^\perp \\ &= PSP^\perp [P^\perp TP, PRP]P + PSP^\perp TPRP^\perp. \end{aligned}$$

As seen above, $P\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})P^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ yielding that the operator $PSP^\perp TPRP^\perp$ lies in $\mathcal{L}$. Consequently,

$$PSP^\perp TPRP^\perp = P(PSP^\perp TPRP^\perp)P^\perp$$

lies in $\mathcal{K}_V(\mathcal{L})$. Moreover, by Lemma 3.2, $P^\perp TP \in \mathcal{L}$, from which follows that $[P^\perp TP, PRP] \in \mathcal{L}$. Hence, $PSP^\perp [P^\perp TP, PRP]P \in \mathcal{K}_D(\mathcal{L})$. It follows that $\mathcal{K}_D(\mathcal{L})\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N}) \subseteq \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})$.

Finally, it will be shown that $\mathcal{K}_\Delta(\mathcal{L})\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N}), \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})\mathcal{K}_\Delta(\mathcal{L}) \subseteq \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})$. That is to say that, it must be proved that, for all $T \in \mathcal{L}, S, R \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ and $P \in \mathcal{N}$, the operators $P^\perp TPSP^\perp R$ and $RP^\perp TPSP^\perp$ lie in $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})$.

Suppose again that $P\mathcal{L}P^\perp = P\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})P^\perp$. Recall that, by Lemma 3.3, the only other possibility is $P^\perp \mathcal{L}P = \{0\}$, in which case the assertions to be proved trivially hold.

Since $SP^\perp R \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$, it follows that $P^\perp TPSP^\perp R = P^\perp TP(SP^\perp R)P^\perp$ lies in $\mathcal{K}_\Delta(\mathcal{L})$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} RP^\perp TPSP^\perp &= PRP^\perp TPSP^\perp + P^\perp RP^\perp TPSP^\perp \\ &= PRP^\perp TPSP^\perp + P^\perp [P^\perp RP^\perp, P^\perp TP]PSP^\perp. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that $PRP^\perp TPSP^\perp \in P\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})P^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{K}_V(\mathcal{L})$, since it is assumed that $P\mathcal{L}P^\perp = P\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})P^\perp$. Moreover, $P^\perp [P^\perp RP^\perp, P^\perp TP]PSP^\perp$ lies in $\mathcal{K}_\Delta(\mathcal{L})$, since $[P^\perp RP^\perp, P^\perp TP] \in \mathcal{L}$. $\square$

Lemma 3.6. *Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a weakly closed Lie $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -module and let $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})$ be the weakly closed $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -bimodule associated with $\mathcal{L}$ in (3.3). Then $[\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L}), \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})] \subseteq \mathcal{L}$.*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{K}_V(\mathcal{L}), \mathcal{K}_L(\mathcal{L}) \subseteq \mathcal{L}$, it is enough to prove that $[\mathcal{K}_D(\mathcal{L}), \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})], [\mathcal{K}_\Delta(\mathcal{L}), \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})] \subseteq \mathcal{L}$. That is to say that, it suffices to show that for all $T \in \mathcal{L}, P \in \mathcal{N}$ and $R, S \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$, the operators $[PSP^\perp TP, R]$ and $[P^\perp TPSP^\perp, R]$ lie in $\mathcal{L}$.

Recall once again that, given $P \in \mathcal{N}$, by Lemma 3.3, either $P\mathcal{L}P^\perp = P\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})P^\perp$ or $P^\perp \mathcal{L}P = \{0\}$. In the latter case, for all $T \in \mathcal{L}$, $P^\perp TP = 0$, from which follows that the assertions to be proved are trivially true.

Suppose now that $P\mathcal{L}P^\perp = P\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})P^\perp$ and that $T \in \mathcal{L}$ is such that $P^\perp TP \neq 0$, in which case, by Lemma 3.2, $P^\perp TP \in \mathcal{L}$. Then, for all $R, S \in \mathcal{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} [PSP^\perp TP, R] &= [PSP^\perp TP, RP] + [PSP^\perp TP, PRP^\perp] + [PSP^\perp TP, P^\perp RP^\perp] \\ &= [PSP^\perp TP - P^\perp TPSP^\perp, RP] + PSP^\perp TPRP^\perp \\ &= [[PSP^\perp, P^\perp TP], RP] + PSP^\perp TPRP^\perp \end{aligned}$$

lies in $\mathcal{L}$. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} [P^\perp TPSP^\perp, R] &= [P^\perp TPSP^\perp, RP] + [P^\perp TPSP^\perp, PRP^\perp] + [P^\perp TPSP^\perp, P^\perp RP^\perp] \\ &= -PRP^\perp TPSP^\perp + [P^\perp TPSP^\perp - PSP^\perp TP, P^\perp RP^\perp] \\ &= -PRP^\perp TPSP^\perp + [[P^\perp TP, PSP^\perp], P^\perp RP^\perp] \end{aligned}$$

is an operator in $\mathcal{L}$, which concludes the proof. $\square$

Recall that it is possible to associate with each weakly closed $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -bimodule $\mathcal{K}$ a (not necessarily unique) left order continuous homomorphism $\phi: \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ such that $\mathcal{K} = \{T \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}): \phi(P)^\perp TP = 0\}$ (see Lemma 2.8 and Remark 2.9).

Lemma 3.7. *Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a weakly closed Lie $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -module, let $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})$ be the weakly closed $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -bimodule defined in (3.3)–(3.7), and let $\phi(P): \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ be a left order continuous homomorphism associated with $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})$. If $P \in \mathcal{N}$ is such that $\phi(P) < P$, then, for all $T \in \mathcal{L}$ and all $Q \in \mathcal{N}$ with $\phi(P) < Q < P$, $(Q - \phi(P))T(P - Q) = 0$.*

Proof. Let T be an operator in $\mathcal{L}$ and let that $P, Q \in \mathcal{N}$. Since, by the definition (3.3)–(3.7) of $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})$, $QTQ^\perp \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})$, it follows that $\phi(P)^\perp(QTQ^\perp)P = 0$. Hence, if $\phi(P) < Q < P$, then $(Q - \phi(P))T(P - Q) = 0$, as required. $\square$

Given a weakly closed Lie $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -module $\mathcal{K}$, define $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{K}}$ as the algebra consisting of all operators $T \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{N})$ such that, for every $P \in \mathcal{N}$ for which $\phi(P) < P_-$, there exists λ_P in $\mathbb{C}$ satisfying the equality $T(P - \phi(P)) = \lambda_P(P - \phi(P))$. The algebra $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{K}}$ is a von Neumann subalgebra of $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{N})$ and, when $\mathcal{K}$ is a weakly closed Lie ideal of $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$, the algebra $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{K}}$ is exactly that defined in [6].

The next lemma is inspired by results of [6] and by the proofs therein.

Lemma 3.8. *Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a weakly closed Lie $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -module. Then $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L}) + \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})}$.*

Proof. Let π be an expectation of $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ on $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{N})$ (see [2], Corollary 8.5). Given $T \in \mathcal{L}$, let $T = T_\pi + \pi(T)$, where $T_\pi = T - \pi(T)$. Firstly, it will be shown that $T_\pi \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})$; that is to say that, for all $P \in \mathcal{N}$, $\phi(P)^\perp T_\pi P = 0$, where $\phi: \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$ is a left order continuous homomorphism on $\mathcal{N}$ associated with the bimodule $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})$.

Let Q be a projection in $\mathcal{N}$. Notice that $\phi(P)^\perp Q^\perp TQP = 0$, since $Q^\perp TQ \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})$ (see (3.3)–(3.7)). Then,

$$\begin{aligned} Q^\perp(\phi(P)^\perp T_\pi P)Q &= \phi(P)^\perp(Q^\perp T_\pi Q)P \\ &= \phi(P)^\perp Q^\perp TQP - \phi(P)^\perp Q^\perp \pi(T)QP \\ &= -\phi(P)^\perp Q^\perp \pi(T)QP. \end{aligned}$$

But, since by [2], Theorem 8.1, $\phi(P)^\perp Q^\perp \pi(T)QP = \pi(\phi(P)^\perp Q^\perp TQP)$, it follows that, for all $Q \in \mathcal{N}$, $Q^\perp(\phi(P)^\perp T_\pi P)Q = 0$. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} Q\phi(P)^\perp T_\pi PQ^\perp &= \phi(P)^\perp(QTQ^\perp)P - \phi(P)^\perp Q\pi(T)Q^\perp P \\ &= -\pi(\phi(P)^\perp QTQ^\perp P) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for all $P, Q \in \mathcal{N}$,

$$(3.8) \quad \phi(P)^\perp T_\pi P = Q\phi(P)^\perp T_\pi PQ + Q^\perp \phi(P)^\perp T_\pi PQ^\perp,$$

from which follows that $\phi(P)^\perp T_\pi P \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{N})$. Hence, by [2], Theorem 8.1,

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(P)^\perp T_\pi P &= \pi(\phi(P)^\perp T_\pi P) \\ &= \phi(P)^\perp \pi(T_\pi)P \\ &= \phi(P)^\perp \pi(T - \pi(T))P.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\pi(T - \pi(T)) = 0$, it follows that, for all $P \in \mathcal{N}$, $\phi(P)^\perp T_\pi P = 0$ or, in other words, T_π lies in $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})$.

It remains to show that $\pi(T)$ lies in $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})}$. Let $P \in \mathcal{N}$ be such that $\phi(P) < P_-$. Then, there exists a projection $Q \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $\phi(P) < Q < P$.

Since $QTQ^\perp \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})$ (see (3.3)–(3.7)), it follows that, for all $P \in \mathcal{N}$, $\phi(P)^\perp (QTQ^\perp)P = 0$. Observe also that, since $T_\pi \in \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})$, by Lemma 3.6, $[\pi(T), \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})] \subseteq \mathcal{L}$. Hence, for all $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$, $[\pi(T), (Q - \phi(P))(x \otimes y)(P - Q)] \in \mathcal{L}$. It follows, by Lemma 3.7, that

$$(Q - \phi(P))[\pi(T), (Q - \phi(P))(x \otimes y)(P - Q)](P - Q) = 0$$

and, consequently,

$$((P - Q)x \otimes (Q - \phi(P))\pi(T)(Q - \phi(P))y) = ((P - Q)\pi(T)^*(P - Q)x \otimes (Q - \phi(P))y)$$

Choosing $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $x = (P - Q)x$ and $y = (Q - \phi(P))y$, it is easy to see that there must exist $\lambda_P \in \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$\pi(T)(P - Q) = \lambda_P(P - Q)$$

and

$$\pi(T)(Q - \phi(P)) = \lambda_P(Q - \phi(P)).$$

It follows that

$$\pi(T)(P - \phi(P)) = \lambda_P(P - \phi(P)),$$

yielding that $\pi(T)$ lies in $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})}$, as required. $\square$

Given a weakly closed Lie $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -module, let $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L})$ be the $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -bimodule defined at the beginning of this section and let $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})$ be defined by (3.3)–(3.7). The next theorem summarises the main results of Section 3.

Theorem 3.9. *Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a weakly closed Lie $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -module. Then, there exist weakly closed $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -bimodules $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})$ and a von Neumann subalgebra $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})}$ of the diagonal $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{N})$ such that*

$$\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}) \subseteq \mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L}) + \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})}.$$

Moreover,

$$\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}) = \overline{\text{span}}^w(\{QB(\mathcal{H})P^\perp : P, Q \in \mathcal{N}, QB(\mathcal{H})P^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{L}\})$$

is the largest weakly closed $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})$ -bimodule contained in $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})$ is such that $[\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L}), \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{N})] \subseteq \mathcal{L}$.

Example 3.10. Notice that neither is it necessarily the case that $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}) \subseteq \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})$ nor that $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})$. A simple counter-example can be given in the nest algebra of the 5×5 upper triangular complex matrices. Consider the Lie module $\mathcal{L} = \text{span}\{I\} + \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L})$, where $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L})$ is the bimodule consisting of the 5×5 complex matrices such that $a_{i1} = 0$, if $1 \leq i \leq 5$, and $a_{i2} = 0$, if $3 \leq i \leq 5$. In this case, $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})$ consists of the matrices in $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L})$ such that $a_{22} = 0$.

Remark 3.11. When $\mathcal{L}$ is a weakly closed Lie ideal, $\mathcal{K}_L(\mathcal{L}), \mathcal{K}_D(\mathcal{L}), \mathcal{K}_\Delta(\mathcal{L}) = \{0\}$. In this situation, it has been shown in [1] that there exists a certain unital weakly closed $*$ -subalgebra $\check{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{L})$ of $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})}$ such that

$$\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L}) \subseteq \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}) \subseteq \mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L}) + \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{L})} = \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}) \oplus \check{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{L}).$$

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Almeida and L. Oliveira, *A decomposition theorem for Lie ideals in nest algebras*, Arch. Math. **97** (2011), 549–558.
- [2] K.R. Davidson, *Nest Algebras*, Longman, 1988.
- [3] K.R. Davidson, A.P. Donsig and T.D. Hudson, *Norm-closed bimodules of nest algebras*, J. Operator Theory **39** (1998), 59–87.
- [4] J.A. Erdos and S.C. Power, *Weakly closed ideals of nest algebras*, J. Operator Theory (2) **7** (1982), 219–235.
- [5] C.K. Fong, C.R. Miers and A.R. Sourour, *Lie and Jordan ideals of operators on Hilbert space*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. (4) **84** (1982), 516–520.
- [6] T.D. Hudson, L.W. Marcoux and A.R. Sourour, *Lie ideals in triangular operator algebras*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. (8) **350** (1998), 3321–3339.
- [7] L. Oliveira, *Finite rank operators in Lie ideals of nest algebras*, Houston J. Math. (2) **37** (2011), 519–536.
- [8] J. R. Ringrose, *On some algebras of operators*, Proc. London Math. Soc **15** (1965), 61–83.

CENTER FOR MATHEMATICAL ANALYSIS, GEOMETRY AND DYNAMICAL SYSTEMS and DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INSTITUTO SUPERIOR TÉCNICO, UNIVERSIDADE DE LISBOA, AV. ROVISCO PAIS 1049-001 LISBOA PORTUGAL

E-mail address: `linaoliv@math.tecnico.ulisboa.pt`

INSTITUTO SUPERIOR TÉCNICO, UNIVERSIDADE DE LISBOA, AV. ROVISCO PAIS 1049-001 LISBOA PORTUGAL

E-mail address: `miguel.m.santos@ist.utl.pt`